Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Bisayan Dialects. — By Dr. FRANK R. BLAKE, Johns Hopkins University.

AMONG the large number of idioms which are spoken in the Philippine Islands, that which stands next in rank to Tagalog, the most important and best known language of the Archipelago, is undoubtedly Bisayan, which is spoken by more people than any other Philippine idiom, forming the medium of daily intercourse of over three million souls, almost half the civilized population of the islands. Its territory is also more extensive than that of any of its sister tongues, embracing the Bisayan Islands, viz.: the large islands, Panay, Negros, Cebu, Bohol, Samar, Leyte, and the small islands, Romblon, Tablas, and Sibuyan; and the north and east coasts of Mindanao: it also forms one of the idioms spoken in the island of Masbate, in the Calamianes Islands, and on the coast of Mindoro.

As would naturally be expected in a language spoken in so many separate places with but imperfect means of communication between them, Bisayan appears in a number of different dialects.

The Austin friars Buzeta and Bravo in their Philippine Encyclopedia[1] enumerate four dialects, viz.:

1) that of Panay, spoken in the town of Iloilo, in the islands Romblon, Tablas, Sibuyan, in the northwestern part of the island of Negros, and in Mindanao in the districts of Misamis and Caraga, and in the town of Zamboanga.
2) that of Capiz on the island of Panay, which differs little from the above.
3) Cebuano, spoken in the islands of Cebu and Bohol, and in the island of Negros in the parts next to Cebu. Those who speak this dialect are said to understand without difficulty the dialect of Iloilo.
4) the dialect of the Calamianes group, and of that part of the island of Paragua which was conquered by the Spaniards. It is said to be a mixture of Tagalog and Bisayan.

[1] *Diccionario geográfico, estadístico, histórico de las Islas Filipinas*, Madrid, 1851, vol. i, p. 66.

The statement is also made that the inhabitants of Iloilo do not understand those of the island of Samar, though nothing further is said about the dialect of Samar, and nothing at all about that of the adjoining island of Leyte.

In 'El Archipiélago Filipino,'[1] an encyclopedic work on the islands prepared by the Jesuits, where the languages spoken in each district are enumerated, the following references are made to Bisayan and its dialects. Visaya (*sic*) without specification of dialect, is said to be spoken in the islands of Romblon, Tablas, Sibuyan, Masbate, Panay, Negros, Leyte, in the Calamian and Cuyo groups, and in the districts of Surigao and Davao on the island of Mindanao. The inhabitants of the district of Antique on the island of Panay are said to speak a somewhat modified form of Visaya. In Zamboanga on Mindanao is spoken a jargon which is a mixture of Spanish, Tagalog, Visaya, and Moro. Visaya Panayano is said to be spoken in the island of Mindoro, and Panayano in Negros; Visaya Cebuano in Cebu and the district of Misamis; Visaya Boholano in Bohol. Nothing is said of the language spoken in Samar.

Professor Ferdinand Blumentritt of Leitmeritz, Bohemia, the greatest living authority on the Philippine Islands, gives the following notices of Bisayan and its various dialects in his 'List of the Native Tribes of the Philippines and of the Languages spoken by them.'[2]

Bisaya is divided into several dialects of which Cebuano and Panayano are the most important. Caraga is said to be the name of a dialect, perhaps Bisayan, which was formerly spoken on the east coast of Mindanao; at the present time, however, only Bisayan is spoken there. Hiliguayna, Hiligueyna or Hiligvoyna[3] is the name given to the dialect spoken on the coast of Panay. Halaya is a dialect of the interior of the same island. Haraya is a dialect of Panay nearly identical with the foregoing.

---

[1] Washington, 1900. Cf. Tratado I, passim.

[2] Cf. Blumentritt, *List of the Native Tribes of the Philippines and of the languages spoken by them*, trans. by O. T. Mason in Smithsonian Inst. Report for year ending June, 1899, Washington, 1901, pp. 527–547.

[3] Spelt also Hiligayna in the grammar of Mentrida and Aparicio, cf. below p. 122, ft. nt. 1.

From these incomplete and conflicting statements alone it would be very difficult, if not practically impossible, to obtain any adequate idea of the real number and distribution of the Bisayan dialects, but with the help of grammars, vocabularies, texts, etc., of the various dialects much may be accomplished.[1]

In the first place the fourth dialect of Buzeta and Bravo is probably not a Bisayan dialect. This is indicated by the fact that both Blumentritt and 'El Archipiélago Filipino' regard Calamiano or Calamian as a distinct language, and is clearly evident from a short Calamian vocabulary[2] by an Austin friar who was at one time Provincial Vicar of the province of Calamianes. As the district assigned to Calamian by Buzeta and Bravo corresponds to the habitat of the Tagbanuas, it is probable that Calamian is only another name for Tagbanua. Besides the language called Calamian, however, some form of Bisayan is also spoken in the Calamian group.

Secondly, Hiliguayna and Panayano or Panayan appear, from a comparison of the Hiliguayna grammar of Mentrida, and the Panayan grammar of Lozano, to be simply two names for the same dialect. The few minor differences between the two grammars seem to be due simply to the fact that the statements of the latter are abridged and often imperfect, while the former gives in many cases forms which are rare or only used in certain districts. At any rate these differences are so slight that, even if they represent differences in the spoken language, we are justified in classing the dialects of the two grammars together under one head.

---

[1] The most important of these grammars and dictionaries are the following:

Zueco, *Método del Dr. Ollendorff . . . adaptado al bisaya*, Manila, 1871.

Bermejo, *Arte conpendiado de la lengua cebuana*, 2ª, ed., Tambobong, 1894.

Mentrida and Aparicio, *Arte de la lengua bisaya-hiligayna*, Tambobong, 1894.

Lozano, *Cursos de lengua panayana*, Manila, 1876.

Figueroa, *Arte del idioma visaya de Samar y Leite* 2ª, ed., Binondo 1872.

Encarnacion, *Diccionario bisaya-español* and *Dicc. español-bisaya*, 3ª ed., Manila, 1885.

[2] Reprinted by W. E. Retana in *Archivo del Bibliofilo Filipino*, Madrid, 1895-98, vol. ii, pp. 211-224.

The principal difference between the Haraya and Halaya dialects, which are said to be almost identical, is in all probability that which is shown in the names themselves, i. e., an *l* in Halaya is represented by an *r* in Haraya.

The dialect of Bohol and Misamis, as stated in 'El Archipiélago Filipino,' is without doubt Cebuan. This is rendered *a priori* probable with regard to Misamis by the fact that the tribes of the northeastern part of Mindanao were found by Magellan, who discovered the islands in 1521, to be united by ties of friendship with the inhabitants of Cebu;[1] and is made practically certain by the Bisayan grammar of Zueco, which was written by a priest of Misamis, and treats the Bisayan spoken in Cebu, Bohol and Misamis. The statement of Buzeta and Bravo that the dialect of Misamis is the same as that of Iloilo, seems to be simply an error.

In Negros, according to Buzeta and Bravo, Cebuano is spoken in the part adjacent to Cebu and the dialect of Iloilo in the northwest. 'El Archipiélago Filipino' gives the languages of Negros as Visaya and Panayano, which probably means the same as the preceding.

None of these authorities made any direct reference to the dialect of Samar and Leyte, which is a distinct dialect as shown by Figueroa's grammar of the Bisayan of Samar and Leyte.

The principal dialects and their approximate territory, therefore, may be set down as follows:

1) Cebuano or Cebuan, in Cebu, Bohol, eastern Negros and north and east (?) Mindanao.
2) Hiliguayna, Panayano or Panayan, on the coast of Panay, part of Negros, the Romblon group, and the southern coast of Mindoro; perhaps also in the Calamian and Cuyo islands, since they are near Panay. The term Hiliguayna is to be preferred, as this dialect is not the only one spoken on Panay.
3) Haraya or Harayan, including Halaya or Halayan, in the interior of Panay.
4) Samaro-Leytean in Samar and Leyte.

What dialect is spoken in the island of Masbate is uncertain. Besides the dialects here given, there are probably others, as

[1] Cf. Foreman, *The Philippine Islands*, 2d ed., New York, 1899, p. 22.

seems to be indicated by the statements with regard to the dialects of the districts of Capiz and Antique on the island of Panay, but these will in all probability be found to be simply minor subdivisions of one or the other of the four groups just given.

The principal features which the Bisayan dialects possess in common have been enumerated in my paper on 'Differences between Tagalog and Bisayan,'[1] so it will not be necessary to repeat them here. The differences among the various dialects are lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactical. In the present paper the discussion will be confined to the last three classes. As the only materials for the study of the Harayan dialect are a few paradigms and remarks in Mentrida and Aparicio's Hiliguayna grammar (pp. 18–20), the following comparative sketch will be concerned chiefly with the Cebuan, Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean dialects.

Phonology.

Phonetic changes are few. In Samaro-Leytean final guttural nasal *ng* becomes the dental nasal *n*, e. g., *an* 'the'=Hiliguayna

[1] JAOS. vol. xxv, pp. 162–169. The particle *ug* is used in Cebuan after *wala* in the same way as *sing* in Hiliguayna (cf. p. 169 of article cited), e. g., *wala akó ug humay* 'I have no rice,' though it does not appear to be very common. Cf. Encarnación, *Dicc.*, article *og*, p. 252 *a*. Some additional differences are the following, viz.:

1) The Bisayan particles *sing* and *ug* are used before a noun which modifies an adjective and indicates 'in what respect,' e. g., *masakit ako sing olo* 'I am sick with respect to the head, I have a headache;' *maayo ug dagway* 'good with respect to appearance, of good appearance;' in this case Tagalog employs the nominative with the article *ang*, e. g., *ang mangá síḍa ang baít* 'those destroyed with respect to the intelligence, the insane.'

2) The negative of the preterite is made in all the Bisayan dialects with the negative of indefinite possession plus the imperative-infinitive, e. g., Ceb. *wala buhaton nia* or *wala nia buhata* 'he did not do it;' instead of, as in Tagalog, with the regular negative plus the preterite, e. g., *hindî niyá ginawâ*.

3) The Bisayan particles *ig-*, *iga-* in the *i* passive (cf. below p. 132), and suffix *-a*, *-ha* with nouns modified by interrogative adjectives, e. g., Ceb. *onsa-ng iro-a* 'what dog?' Hil. *ano nga tawo-ha* 'what man?' have no parallels in Tagalog.

4) The two languages also exhibit a number of differences in nominal and verbal derivation, but these cannot be discussed here in detail.

and Cebuan *ang ; sin* indefinite accusative particle=Hiliguayna *sing ; -n* ligature after a vowel=Hiliguayna and Cebuan *-ng*. Cases in which the ligature appears as *-ng* instead of *-n*, e. g., *ito-ng balay*[1] 'that house,' are perhaps to be explained as due to the influence of the guttural nasal in the fuller form of the ligature *nga*.

Original *r* is preserved in Samaro-Leytean, but changed to *l* in Cebuan and Hiliguayna, e. g.:

Sam.-Ley.	Ceb. and Hil.
diri 'not'	*dili*
sira 'they'	*sila*
surat 'write'	*sulat*.

That the change is from *r* to *l* and not vice versa is shown by the fact that, while words which have *r* in Samaro-Leytean have regularly *l* in Cebuan and Hiliguayna, many words appear in all these dialects with *l*, e. g., *balay* 'house,' where if the change were from *l* to *r*, we should expect Samaro-Leytean **baray*. Moreover in Tagalog, where an original *r* regularly becomes *l*, as is seen from the treatment of loan words (e. g., *antála* 'interrupt' from Sanskrit *antarā* 'between'; *compisál* 'confess' from Spanish *confesar*)[2] words which have *r* in Samaro-Leytean appear with *l*. On the other hand, a common Bisayan *l*, when intervocalic, is lost in the Tagalog (e. g., *dáan* 'road'=Bisayan *dalan*) according to the regular treatment of original intervocalic *l* in that language.[3]

Morphology.

The nominative of the simple definite article is *ang* in Cebuan and Hiliguayna, *an* in Samaro-Leytean, *ya* or *nan* in Harayan. Cebuan and Harayan have only one other case, which is used for all the oblique cases, Cebuan *sa*, Harayan *sa*, *et*,[4] *kan*. Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean, like Tagalog, have a special

---

[1] Cf. Figueroa, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[2] Cf. my paper, *Sanskrit Loan-words in Tagalog*, JHU. Circs. No. 163, p. 64b.

[3] Cf. my paper, *Differences between Tagalog and Bisayan*, p. 164.

[4] Identical with *ed*, the oblique case of the article in Pangasinan.

form for the genitive, Hiliguayna *sang*, Samaro-Leytean *san*, *kanan*, *nan*;[1] both dialects have *sa* in the oblique case.

The personal article, a particle which always precedes proper names of persons, has the same nominative and genitive forms in all the dialects, viz., *si*, *ni*; in the oblique case, Cebuan and Samaro-Leytean have *kan*, Harayan, *kay*, Hiliguayna, either *kan* or *kay*.

The inclusive article, which is used before proper names of persons to indicate that the person mentioned is accompanied by his companions, friends, family, or those who are connected with him in some way, has in Cebuan and Samaro-Leytean the following forms, viz.:

Ceb.	Sam.-Ley.
nom. *sa Pedro*	*sira Pedro*
gen. *na Pedro*	*nira Pedro*
obl. *ka Pedro*	*kanda Pedro.*

In Hiliguayna there are a number of ways of expressing this article, viz.:

nom. *sanday Pedro*, *sila nay Pedro*, *sila ni Pedro*
gen. *nanday Pedro*, *ila nay Pedro*, *ila ni Pedro*
obl. *kanday Pedro*, *sa ila nay Pedro*, *sa ila ni Pedro.*

The forms *sila si Pedro*, *sila sa Pedro* in the nominative, *nila ni Pedro* in the genitive, and *kanila ni Pedro* in the oblique are also given in the grammars. The idea of plurality in most of these forms seems to be due to the particles *da*, *ra* or *la*, which are probably identical with Ilokan *da* 'they,' a pronoun of the third person plural.

The processes of nominal derivation are in general the same in all the dialects: the majority of the differences which appear to exist are probably simply due to the imperfect statements of the grammars. Peculiar to Samaro-Leytean, however, seem to be abstract forms like *ka-maopay* 'goodness', made with

[1] The form *nan* is used only after the particle *nga* 'say,' e. g., *nga nan padre* 'says the priest'; *nga* is doubtless identical with the ligature, the original meaning of the phrase being something like 'that of the priest,' 'that which he says.' The corresponding Tagalog *a-nang pare* is probably to be analyzed in the same way, for although *a* does not occur in Tagalog as ligature, it is found as such in Ilokan, Ibanag, Pangasinan, Pampanga, and Magindanao.

prefixed *ka* on the basis of the *ma* adjectives; and absolute superlative forms like *gi-dadako-i* 'very large,' *gi-mamatam-'is-i* 'very sweet,' made on the basis of roots and *ma* adjectives by prefixing *gi* and suffixing *i* to the root or adjective with its first syllable reduplicated.

The plural of nouns is regularly indicated as in Tagalog by the particle *manĝa*, e. g., *tao* 'man,' *manĝa tao* 'men.' In Samaro-Leytean, however, certain adjectives form their plural by means of a *g* inserted after the first syllable, e. g., *maopay* 'good,' pl. *magopay; dako* 'large,' pl. *dagko*. This *g* is probably the same as the *g* in Ilokan *da-g-iti*, the plural of *iti* 'the."[1] This pluralizing *g* is found also in the verbal particles *makag-*, *makig-*, *manag-*, *manig-*, *masig-* = *magsi-*. It is also quite likely that the verbal prefix *mag* contains this *g*, as verbs made with this particle in Tagalog often have an intensive or frequentative idea, e. g., *sumúlat* 'write,' *magsúlat* 'write a great deal."[2] Cf. also below p. 133.

The Bisayan dialects have developed a sort of indefinite accusative particle, which is in Cebuan usually *ug*, sometimes *ak*, in Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean *sing* and *sin* respectively.[3]

The ligatures are practically the same in all the dialects, viz., *-ng* after a vowel, *nĝa* after a vowel or consonant; in Samaro-Leytean *-ng* usually becomes *-n* according to the regular phonetic laws of the dialect, though *-ng* also occurs (cf. above, p. 124).

In the forms of the personal pronouns there are a number of differences. Harayan possesses in the first person singular nominative, besides the usual form *ako*, the form *akota*, apparently a combination of *ako* and its genitive *ta*, the original meaning being, perhaps, something like 'I, for my part,' 'I myself.' The genitive and oblique forms of the pronoun of the first person singular and plural, with the exception of the genitive forms

---

[1] *Da* is here, as above, no doubt identical with the pronoun *da* of the third person plural, the word being thus a sort of double plural.

[2] Cf. Totanes, *Arte de la lengua tagala*, reimpr., Binondo, 1865, p. 45.

[3] For the various uses of these particles cf. my paper, *Differences between Tagalog and Bisayan*, p. 168f.; also above, p. 124, ft. nt. While the statements of Figueroa with regard to *sin* are by no means explicit, it seems to be employed in general like Hiliguayna *sing*, though it does not appear to be used after the negative *waray*.

ko and *ta*, end in Cebuan in *o* or *u*, in the other dialects in *on* or *un*, e. g.:

Cebuan.	Other dialects.
áko 'mine'	*akon*
kanako 'to me'	*kanakon*
nato 'our'	*naton*, etc.

Cebuan seems to be the only dialect which has a dual. *Kita*, which is used for the dual of the first person in Tagalog, is the pronoun of the second person plural inclusive in Bisayan in general. In Cebuan, however, a distinction between dual and plural is made by means of the accent, viz., *kíta* 'we (pl.),' *kitá* 'we (dual).'

In the second person singular nominative, Harayan possesses, besides the forms common to all the dialects, viz., *ikaw* and *ka*, the form *kaw*. In the second person plural, genitive and oblique, the Samaro-Leytean forms are made from a stem *iyo*, the Cebuan and Hiliguayna forms from a stem *inyo* with an infixed *n*, e. g.:

Sam.-Ley.	Ceb. and Hil.
gen. *iyo*, *niyo*	*inyo*, *ninyo*
obl. *sa iyo*, etc.	*sa inyo*, etc.[1]

The pronouns of the third person singular and plural are in Harayan entirely different from the regular forms in the other dialects, viz., *tana* 'he,' *sanda* 'they;' in the other dialects they are like the Tagalog forms, viz., *siya*, *sila*. The plural *sanda*, however, is used in Hiliguayna alongside of *sila*, and appears also in the inclusive article *sanday* (cf. above, p. 126). In Cebuan the genitive *niya* has a by-form *na* which is identical with the genitive of Harayan *tana*. On the other hand, Harayan has in the oblique case, beside the forms derived from *tana*, viz., *kana*, *kanana*, the form *kaniya* from the same stem as the *siya* of the other dialects.

The oblique cases of the pronouns of all persons, singular and plural, are made in general by prefixing the oblique cases of the articles, viz., *sa* or *ka*, *kan* to one of the forms of the genitive.

[1] In Tagalog *iyo* is used as genitive and oblique of the second person singular, *inyo* as genitive and oblique of the second person plural.

Cebuan and Hiliguayna have both series of forms, e. g., *sa imo*, *kanimo* 'to thee.' In Samaro-Leytean the forms with *sa* are the regular ones, forms with *kan* occurring only in the third person singular and plural. In Harayan there are no oblique forms with *sa*. Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean have oblique forms with initial *d*, which is doubtless identical with the *d* in the oblique case of the Tagalog demonstratives *dito*, *dini*, etc., and with the Malay preposition *di* 'in,' e. g., *dakon* 'to me,' *dimo* 'to thee,' etc. In Samaro-Leytean these forms are used especially as datives. In Hiliguayna these *d* forms occur also with prefixed *ka*, e. g., *kadakon*, *kadimo*, etc. In Hiliguayna in the third person singular and plural, *sang* is sometimes used instead of *sa*, e. g., *sang iya*, *sang ila* for *sa iya*, *sa ila*.

The demonstrative pronouns in all the dialects have but two cases, nominative and general oblique, the difference between the two being indicated by what might be called initial inflection. In Cebuan the nominative is the stem or *k*+stem, the oblique, *ni*+stem, e. g., *adto*, *kadto*; *niadto* 'that.' In Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean the stem may also serve as the nominative, but the initial inflectional elements are, *y* for nominative, *s* for oblique, e. g., *adto* (only Sam.-Ley.), *yadto*; *sadto*. In Hiliguayna the nominative has the prefix *y* except in those pronouns beginning with *i*, viz., *ini* 'this,' *ito* 'that;' in Samaro-Leytean the stem form is regular, *y* occurring only in *yadto*. In Harayan the two cases are indicated by initial *d* and *ka* respectively, *ka* being prefixed to the nominative, intervocalic *d* then becoming *ḍ*, e. g., *dagto*, *kaḍagto*. In this pronoun (not in the other demonstratives) the oblique case has also the form *kagto*, *k* taking the place of the *d* of the nominative.

The interrogative pronouns 'who?' and 'what?' are in Cebuan *kinsa* and *onsa*, in Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean, *sin'o* and *ano* as in Tagalog. Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean, however, have different forms for the genitive of *sin'o*, viz., Hil. *kaysin'o*, *kanin'o*, *kalin'o*; Sam.-Ley. *kanay*.

The tens of the cardinal numerals are indicated in Bisayan in general by abstract forms derived from the units by prefixing *ka* and suffixing *-an*, e. g., *ka-tlo-an* 'thirty' from *tolo* 'three.' In Hiliguayna, however, they are also formed by multiplication as in Tagalog, e. g., *tolo kapolo* 'thirty.' 'Ten' itself is regularly *napolo*, *polo* 'ten' with prefixed *na*, in Bisayan in general. In

Hiliguayna it is made also by multiplication, viz., *usa kapolo*. The intermediate numerals are generally formed by addition in all the dialects, e. g., Ceb. *katloan ug usa*, Hil. and Sam.-Ley. *katloan kag usa* 'thirty and one, thirty-one.' In Samaro-Leytean, however, the intermediate numbers above one hundred are made by placing *may* 'having' between the greater and the following lesser numeral, e. g., *usa kagatos may usa* 'one hundred having one, one hundred and one.' This formation is also found in other Philippine languages. All intermediate numbers about 'twenty' are formed thus in Bikol with *may*, e. g.,

dua -ng polo may saro 'twenty-one,'
sanggatos may saro 'one hundred and one;'

and in Sulu with the synonymous particle *tug*, e. g.,

kauhan tug isa 'twenty-one,'
ang-ratus tug isa 'one hundred and one.'

In Hiliguayna a combination of the constructions with *kag* and *may* is sometimes found, e. g., *kaluhaan kag may usa* 'twenty-one.'

The prefixes which are used to form active verbs from roots are in general the same in all the dialects, though there are some minor differences. The particle *mangĩ* seems to occur only in Cebuan; *mangin*, *manum*, *mapat*, *masagin*, only in Hiliguayna; *mai* or *mati*, only in Samaro-Leytean. Cebuan has apparently no *magin;* Hiliguayna, no *mahi*, Samaro-Leytean, no *makag*, *manag*, *manig*. In Hiliguayna the particle *manig* appears in the forms *manik* and *mani*, the latter being *manig* minus the pluralizing *g*. Cebuan and Hiliguayna *masig* corresponds to Samaro-Leytean *magsi*, the two particles differing only in the position of the pluralizing *g*.

In the active verb the dialects differ mainly in the representation of the future and present. In Cebuan these tenses do not differ from the imperative-infinitive and preterite, except in those verbs made with the particles *mag*, *um* and *pa*, i. e., all other verbal classes have but two tense forms, e. g., imperative and future *man-lohod*, preterite and present *nan-lohod* 'kneel.' In Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean the most usual way of forming the future and present is, as in Tagalog, by reduplicating a syllable, sometimes of the root, sometimes of the verbal

particle, in the imperative and preterite respectively, e. g., imperative *man-lohod*, future *man-lolohod*, preterite *nan-lohod*, present *nan-lolohod*. In Hiliguayna, however, the unreduplicated forms may also be used for present and future.

In Cebuan, verbs of the *mag* class make their future and present by inserting an *a* after the verbal particle in imperative and preterite respectively; this formation is found in Hiliguayna also, alongside of the forms with reduplication, e. g., imperative *mag-buhat*, future *maga-buhat*, preterite *nag-buhat*, present *naga-buhat* 'do, make.'[1]

Verbs of the *um* class differ considerably in the formation of their tenses in the various dialects. From the root *sulat* 'write' the tense forms are as follows, viz.:

	Ceb.	Hil.	Sam.-Ley.
Impr.	*sumulat*	*sumulat*	*sumurat*
Fut.	*musulat*	*musulat* *sumusulat*	*masurat*
Pret.	*misulat* *minsulat*	*sinmulat*	*sinmurat* *sinurat*
Pres.	*misulat*	*sinmusulat*	*nasurat.*

In roots beginning with a vowel all the particles are prefixed, e. g., *um-abut* 'arrive,' etc. The preterite in these forms is indicated by an *in* element which is no doubt identical with the particle *in* that is found in the preterite and present passive in both Bisayan and Tagalog, e. g., *s-in-ulat* 'was written.'[2] The particles *mi* and *min* in Cebuan probably bear the same relation to one another as the passive particles *gi* and *gin* below. In Hiliguayna reduplication is employed to denote present and future. The Samaro-Leytean present and future are to be compared with the Tagalog present with prefixed *na*, e. g., *nasulat*, which is a by-form of the regular present, e. g., *sungmusulat* or *sumusulat*.

---

[1] For an explanation of the probable nature of this *a*, cf. my paper, *Differences between Tagalog and Bisayan*, p. 166.

[2] The Tagalog suffix *in* of the imperative and future of the *in* passive, e. g., *sulát-in*, *susulát-in*, is not identical with this infix-prefix *in*, which is found in the preterite and present of all three passives, e. g., preterite, *s-in-úlat*, *i-s-in-úlat*, *s-in-ulát-an*. This is shown by the fact that the suffix *in* is represented by Bisayan *-on*, e. g., *sulat-on*, while the infix-prefix *in* remains unchanged, e. g., Hiliguayna *s-in-ulat*.

In the *pa* class the dialects have in general three tense forms, viz., present and preterite *napa-*, future *mapa-*, imperative *pa-*, though *mapa-* and *pa-* may be used promiscuously for either future or imperative. In Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean present and future have also reduplicated forms.

In the passive the dialects differ in the use of reduplication, as in the active, and also in the form of the essential passive particles.

The preterite of all three passives, *on*, *i*, *an*, is indicated in Cebuan by a prefix *gi*, in Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean by a prefix *gin* or, as in Tagalog, by a prefix-infix *in*, e. g.:

	Cebuan.	Hil. and Sam.-Ley.
in pass.	*gi-buhat*	*gin-buhat*, *b-in-uhat*
i "	*gi-buhat*	*i-gin-buhat*, *i-b-in-uhat*
an "	*gi-buhat-an*	*gin-buhat-an*, *b-in-uhat-an.*

In Cebuan *gin* may be used instead of *gi* in the *i* passive, and forms with *in* seem also to occur. In Cebuan the present is identical with the preterite, except in the *i* passive, where the present has only forms with *gi*. In Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean the presents of all three passives have reduplication, e. g., *ginbubuhat*, *binubuhat*, etc. In Hiliguayna instead of the forms like *ginbubuhat*, forms like *ginabuhat* may be used, *gina-* being a particle of the present formed from *gin-* like *naga-* from *nag-* (cf. above, p. 131).

The future has reduplication in all three passives in Samaro-Leytean; in Cebuan and Hiliguayna only in the *on* and *an* passives; e. g.:

Sam.-Ley.	Ceb. and Hil.
bubuhat-on	*bubuhat-on*
i-bubuhat	
bubuhat-an	*bubuhat-an.*

The future of the *i* passive of these last two dialects is either identical with the imperative, both taking prefixed *i-*, e. g., *i-buhat* 'do,' or the imperative takes *ig-*, the future, *iga-*, the *a* of which is to be explained like that of *gina* above, e. g., *ig-buhat*, *iga-buhat.* In Hiliguayna these forms with *g* are used especially when the subject is plural, or the action of the verb frequentative; in Cebuan, when the subject is the instrument or

cause of the action. In Samaro-Leytean this pluralizing *g*, although apparently not used in the verb, is found in the plural of certain adjectives, cf. above, p. 127.

In Cebuan and Hiliguayna, as in Tagalog, there are a number of impersonal imperative forms made with the suffixes *-a* and *-i*, belonging to the *on* and *an* passives respectively, which are used when the agent of the verbal action is not expressed, e. g., *buhat-a*, *buhat-i*. In Samaro-Leytean these forms are used as the regular personal imperative instead of the forms with the suffixes *on* and *an*.

The verbs with prefix *maha-* or *mahi-* make their passive by changing *maha-* or *mahi-* to *hi-* in imperative and future, to *hin-* in preterite and present, e. g., *hi-gugma*, *hin-gugma* 'love.' In Samaro-Leytean the regular passive formation with *paha-* or *pahi-* is also used, *gin* being prefixed in preterite and present, e. g., *gin-paha-gugma*.

The verbal ideas 'to have (something indefinite)' and indefinite 'there is' are expressed in Bisayan in general, as in Tagalog, by the particle *may;* Cebuan uses also the particles *duna*, *aḍuna* in the same way. 'To be (in a place)' is expressed in Hiliguayna by the particles *aḍi*, *yaḍi* 'be here,' *aḍa*, *yaḍa*, *adto* 'be there,' or by the adverbs of place *diḍi*, *dinhi* 'here,' *diḍa*, *didto* 'there.' In Cebuan the corresponding verbal particles are *nia*, *ania* 'be here' *naa*, *anaa;* *tua*, *atua* 'be there,' the corresponding adverbs, *dinhi*, *diha*, *dito:* the particles are used only when the tense is present, otherwise the adverbs are employed. In Samaro-Leytean a conjugation of three tense forms is made up on the basis of similar particles and adverbs of place, as follows:

	'to be here.'	'to be there.'
Pres.	*iini*	*iito*, *aadto*, *aada*[1]
Pret.	*nakanhi*	*nakadto*, *nakada*
Fut.	*makanhi*	*makadto*, *makada*.

'To have (something definite)' is expressed in the same way as 'to be (in a place)' in the various dialects,[2] the particles and

[1] No doubt cognate with Ilokan *adda* 'there is,' 'to be (in a place),' Malay *ada* 'to be, have.'

[2] No statement with reference to this construction is made in Figueroa's grammar of the dialect of Samar and Leyte, but doubtless it is the same as in the other dialects.

adverbs meaning 'to be here' being used when the possessor is of the first person, the others when the possessor is of the second or third, a distinction also being usually made here between the persons, the forms which mean 'there (near to both speaker and person addressed)' being used for the second, those meaning 'there (over yonder),' for the third; for example, in Cebuan, *naa*, *anaa* are regularly employed with the second person, *tua*, *atua* with the third.

The conjunction 'and' is in Cebuan *ug*, in Hiliguayna *kag* (perhaps a combination of *ka* and *ug*), in Samaro-Leytean *ug*, except in compound numerals, where it is *kag*, e. g., *napolo kag usa* 'ten and one, eleven.'

Syntax.

The ligature seems to be regularly omitted in Samaro-Leytean between a prepositive possessive pronoun and its noun, e. g., *an imo sangkay* 'thy companion,' and between a demonstrative and the plural particle *manga*, e. g., *ini manga tao* 'these men.' In Hiliguayna also, the ligature may be omitted in the first case. The omission of the ligature after the possessives is perhaps due to the fact that many of them end in *n*, e. g., *akon* 'my,' *amon* 'our,' with which final the Samaro-Leytean ligature *-n* would coalesce, and to which the Hiliguayna *-ng* might be assimilated, as quite frequently in Tagalog.

In Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean the oblique case of the demonstrative may be preceded by *sa*, the oblique case of the definite article, as an additional sign of the case, e. g., *sa sini* 'to this.'

In Samaro-Leytean the personal article *si* is often prefixed to the personal pronouns of the first and second person, e. g., *si ako* 'I,' *si ikaw* 'thou.'

The representation in Bisayan of the combination of two personal pronouns or a personal pronoun and a noun which in English are connected by the conjunction 'and,' resembles in general the Tagalog construction, where the plural of the pronoun of the higher rank (even though it is singular in English) reckoning in the order of first, second, and third person, followed by the genitive of the other pronoun or of the noun, is employed. The representation varies somewhat, not only among the various principal dialects, but even within the dialects them-

selves, the first element of the combination, however, being regularly plural. 'Juan and I' is variously rendered as follows:

Cebuan	Dapitan,	*kami ni Juan*
	Mindanao,	*kami kan Juan*
	Cebu and Bohol,	*si Juan ug ako*
	Hiliguayna,	*kami ni Juan*
		kami si Juan
		kami kag si Juan
	Samaro-Leytean,	*si kami ñgan si Juan.*

The most original of these constructions is probably that with the genitive of the second element, viz., *kami ni Juan;* in Mindanao instead of the genitive the oblique is employed; in Hiliguayna the nominative may be used as well as the genitive, and may even be connected with the preceding pronoun by *kag* 'and,' this last construction being probably due to a mixing of the original native construction and one modelled after the more simple Spanish construction, i. e., the conjunction 'and' is used to connect the two elements, but the pronoun remains in the plural. In Cebu and Bohol the Spanish construction has completely replaced the native. In Samaro-Leytean the first element stands in the plural according to the regular native construction, the second element in the nominative except when it is a common noun, which stands in the genitive, e. g., *si kami ñgan san panday* 'the carpenter and I'; the two elements are always connected by a particle *ñgan*, the origin of which is not clear; it may perhaps be a double ligature, viz., *ñga-n.*

In Bisayan in general the subject of a sentence may be followed by the definite article before the predicate, often in the sense of a compound relative 'that which,' 'the one that,' e. g., Hiliguayna *ako ang nagsulat* 'I am the one who wrote.' In Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean the regular article *ang* and *an* may be replaced by the forms *ing* and *in* respectively.[1]

The subject of the particle *may* 'to have' stands in general in the nominative as in Tagalog, e. g., *may bino ako* (nom.) 'I have wine.' In Cebuan, however, it may also be put in the genitive, as it regularly is in the corresponding Ilokan construc-

[1] Identical with *ing*, the nominative of the article in Pampanga.

tion,[1] being construed as a possessive adjective modifying the object of particle, e. g., *may áko-ng* (gen.) *bino.*

In Cebuan in the constructions with *wala*, the negative of *may* and *aḍuna* 'to have,' a particle *y* is regularly used before the object just as the ligature is in Tagalog.[2] The same construction is found in Hiliguayna with the corresponding particle *wala*, *wa*, though here the *y* seems often to have become an integral portion of the particle, especially in the case of the shorter form *wa*. In Samaro-Leytean the negative of *may* is regularly *waray*, with inseparable *y*.

The principal Bisayan dialects, then, are the Cebuan, Hiliguayna, Harayan, and Samaro-Leytean. These differ little in their phonology, and the differences in morphology and syntax, while numerous and important, are often comparatively slight. In many cases, indeed, these differences are rather lexical than morphological and syntactical. The dialects also differ to a greater or less extent in their vocabularies, but the discussion of this subject must be reserved for future treatment.

---

[1] E. g., *adda arak-ko* (gen.).

[2] Cf. my paper *Differences between Tagalog and Bisayan*, p. 168.